Resubmission of the Drawings:

The attached sheets of drawings includes Figures 1-17. These sheets replace the original sheets including Figures 1-17.

Attachment: Replacement Sheets

REMARKS

This Amendment is submitted in response to the Office Action dated March 21, 2008. The Specification has been objected to, Claim 12 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. §101, and Claims 7-12 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102. Claims 12 is amended herein. A Petition for a Two-Month Extension of Time is submitted herewith. A replacement set of drawings is also submitted herewith. Applicants respectfully disagree with and traverse the rejections for at least the reasons discussed below. The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge deposit account 02-1818 for the Extension of Time fee and for any other fees which are due and owing.

The Office Action objected to the Specification because the replacement drawing sheets previously submitted did not include a label of "Replacement Sheet" or "New Sheet." (See, Office Action, pg. 2). Moreover, Applicants again note that on November 18, 2005, Applicants submitted 16 sheets of formal drawings translated in the English language. This is evidenced by the date-stamped postcard from the United States Patent and Trademark Office regarding same, a copy of which is attached herewith and which was also attached to the previous Response. In any event, and in the spirit of cooperation, Applicants are again submitting the English translation of the drawings in formal as 16 sheets including Figures 1-17 with the appropriate labels. Therefore, Applicants believe that the objection to the Specification should be withdrawn, and further that Applicants should not be required to make any payments directed to fees associated with same.

The Office Action rejected Claim 12 under 35 U.S.C. §101 as being directed to non-statutory subject matter. Applicants have amended Claim 12 and respectfully submit that the rejection has been overcome. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request the withdrawal of the §101 rejection of Claim 12.

The Office Action rejected Claims 7-12 under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent Publication No. 2004/0176032 to Kotola et al. ("Kotola"). However, Applicants respectfully submit that the Kotola reference is not prior art to the present application, where the earliest effective prior art date of the Kotola is March 19, 2004, and where the Japanese priority date of the present application is June 6, 2003. Applicants plan to submit an English language translation of the Japanese priority document, and statement verfying same in due course.

Appl. No. 10/557,272 Reply to Office Action of March 21, 2008

Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request that the §102(e) rejection of Claims 7-12 in view of Kotola be withdrawn.

Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit that the present application is in condition for allowance and earnestly solicit reconsideration of same.

Respectfully submitted,

BELL, BOYD & LLOYD LLP

BY.

Thomas C. Basso Reg. No. 46,541 Customer No. 29175

Dated: <u>August 21, 2008</u>